

#### REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,061,056 to Menard et al. The Examiner has further rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard et Al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,787,426 to Koshiba et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Menard et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,240,378 to Imanaka et al.

The Menard et al. patent discloses a television monitoring system with automatic selection of program material of interest and subsequent display under user control, which includes user-operable selection means for inputting criteria identifying program content of interest to a user. This user-operable selection means may be a LAN-connected PC (col. 5, line 26) where the user might enter a series of keywords representing topics of interest. The system automatically records or alerts a user to watch parts of a video stream wherein an actor speaks one or a series of keywords or those keywords occur within a closed caption text (col. 5, lines 5-19; col. 6, lines 24-38). Menard et al. further discloses to automatically create a profile of keywords out of existing database, spreadsheet or a word processor file (col. 5, lines 61-65).

The subject invention, as claimed in claim 1, comprises: "keyword detection means for detecting, as a detected keyword, at least one item of title fragment information of title information

of a television program recorded by the recording means as a processed received television signal, said keyword detection means providing said at least one detected keyword to the selection means as said at least one given keyword." As described in the Substitute Specification on page 5, paragraph [0008], lines 11-22, the keyword detection means forms a list of keywords by examining the title(s) of programs that the user has previously recorded. The keyword detection means then provides this list of keywords to the selection means which compares them to title information of television programs, and then selects the appropriate television program(s) whose title information comprises at least one of the keywords. As such, a keyword is (or keywords are) then determined automatically without any operations by the user being required.

As indicated in MPEP § 2131, it is well-founded that "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Further, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Examiner has indicated that the keyword detection means is disclosed in Menard et al. at col. 5, lines 3-38.

Applicant submits that Menard et al. neither shows or suggests the automatic generation of keyword(s) by the keyword

detection means examining the title(s) of programs recorded by the user. Rather, the system of Menard et al. requires the user to generate the list of keywords and then uses this user-generated list of keywords to select the appropriate programs. In particular, as described in Menard et al. at col. 5, lines 24-30:

"For example, the user might enter a series of key words representing topics of interest. These key words are then entered into a profile database in mass storage device 20 along with the identity of the user. When the selected key words appear in the closed caption data stream, the system generates an alert signal to alert the user."

From the above, it should be clear that Menard et al. requires the user to generate a list of key word(s), and that there is no disclosure or suggestion of the keyword detection means as claimed in claim 1.

The Koshiba et al. patent discloses data sorting, data sorting tree creating, derivative extracting and thesaurus creating apparatus and method, or data processing system, in which a keyword candidate creator section 12 outputs partial strings of characters having a number of characters within a predetermined range, e.g., larger than 3 but smaller than 12.

Applicant submits, however, that Koshiba et al. does not supply that which is missing from Menard et al., i.e., keyword detection means for autonomously generating keyword(s), to be used by the selection means, by the recording arrangement examining the title(s) of programs recorded by the user.

The Imanaka et al. patent discloses a weighting method for use in information extraction and abstracting, based on the

frequency of occurrence of keywords and similarity calculation, in which exception keywords that cannot be used as keywords are stored in the exception keyword storing section.

However, Applicant submits that, similar to Koshiba et al., Imanaka et al. does not supply that which is missing from Menard et al., i.e., keyword detection means for autonomously generating keyword(s), to be used by the selection means, by the recording arrangement examining the title(s) of programs recorded by the user.

In view of the above, Applicant believes that the subject invention, as claimed, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the prior art, either individually or collectively, and as such, is patentable thereover.

Applicant believes that this application, containing claims 1, 2 and 5-10, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by /Edward W. Goodman/  
Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613  
Attorney  
Tel.: 914-333-9611